

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art. Claims 1-15 are now in this application. Independent claims 1, 4, 8 and 13 have been amended and new claims 16-19 have been added as set forth above.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract of the Specification. Applicants have amended the Abstract per the Examiner's suggestion. No new matter has been added. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,219,420 ("Hardy et al.") in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,925,144 ("Sebaa"). Claims 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Hardy et al. in view of Sebaa", in further view of U.S. Patent 6,330,668 ("Curiger et al."). Claims 8, 9 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Hardy et al. in view of Curiger et al. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardy in view of Curiger et al. in further view of U.S. Patent 4,855,581 ("Mertel").

The Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in any combination thereof, disclose or suggest at least the claimed feature of the present invention of disabling a circuit when operating conditions have been altered beyond a predetermined range.

At best, Hardy et al. discloses an encryption algorithm to convert plain text to cipher text. The Examiner relies on col. 4, lines 1-4 to disclose a comparator 68 (see also FIG. 1 of Hardy et al.) that compares a bit balance value output from summing circuit 64 with a minimum bit threshold value (MIN) 72 and a maximum bit threshold value (MAX) 73. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that this comparison corresponds to the predetermined range of operating conditions as specifically recited in the independent claims of the present application. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully traverse the prior art rejections and respectfully request withdrawal thereof.


CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Rob Anderson at (815) 633-2563.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: February 11, 2004



Gregory D. Caldwell
Reg. No. 39,926

Intel Americas, Inc.
2109 Shaw Woods Drive
Rockford, Illinois 61107
(815) 633-2563